

AD-A043 014

ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLL FORT LEAVENWORTH KANS  
FUNCTIONAL TRAINING FOR PROVOST MARSHALS.(U)  
JUN 77 F S CHILTON, L E WISNESKI

**F/G 5/9**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

NL

1 OF 1  
AD  
A043 014

END  
DATE  
FILMED  
9-77  
DDC

AD A 043014

(2) 2

FUNCTIONAL TRAINING FOR PROVOST MARSHALS

A student research paper done as a study project in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation from the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

DDC  
RECEIVED  
AUG 19 1977  
RECEIVED  
B

MAJOR FORREST S. CHILTON  
Section 4

MAJOR LARRY E. WISNESKI  
Section 3

AD No. 1  
DDC FILE COPY

Faculty monitor:

MAJOR J. KOCHENOUR

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Functional Training for Provost Marshals,		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report 10 Jun 77
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Chilton, F. S., Maj, USA Wisneski, L. E., Maj, USA		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) 10 Forrest S. / Chilton Larry E. Wisneski
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Students at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 12 48 p.
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATSW-CD-P		12. REPORT DATE 10 Jun 77
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 42
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) <del>Approved for public release; distribution limited.</del>		
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> <b>DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A</b>            Approved for public release;            Distribution Unlimited         </div>		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) N/A		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Student Study Project at CGSC 1977.		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Army Training, Military Police, Job Training, Law Enforcement, Performance (Human), Assessment, Quality Control, Law Enforcement Officers, Surveys, and Manpower Utilization.		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The authors addressed two major issues in this study: (a) the training needed to inform officers of current law enforcements trends, policies, and methods to prepare them to perform Provost Marshal duties, and (b) the best way to accomplish such training.		

ACCESSION for	
NTIS	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC	Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED	<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION	
BY	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
Dist. AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL	
A	

## PREFACE

As part of the Command and General Staff College curriculum, all students must undertake a student study project. We feel that through the project students have an opportunity to contribute to their basic branch or area of specialty. The 1976-77 approved list of projects provides few choices in the law enforcement field. The study of "Functional Training for Provost Marshals" is a self-initiated student study project which allows the authors both to contribute to and to work in their field of expertise.

Through the CGSC faculty Military Police representative, lists of current topics of importance were provided and discussed. We were very interested in the apparent need to evaluate how the US Army prepares its officers for duties as Provost Marshals. Recognizing the technical competence needed to be a good "top cop" we felt an important contribution to law enforcement activities would result from a study of how well Provost Marshals feel they are trained to do their jobs. The 1976 world-wide assessment of Military Police and Provost Marshal Activities by Department of the



Army reached similar conclusions. Using the results of that assessment as a basis, we developed a project to provide data and recommendations concerning the problem.

The two major issues addressed by the project are:

a. What training is needed to inform officers of current law enforcement trends, policies, and methods, so they are best prepared to perform duties as Provost Marshals? This information would allow an officer on assignment as a Provost Marshal to begin his job with knowledge of the most up-to-date "state of the art" in police science and administration.

b. How is such training best accomplished?

The goals of the project are to:

a. provide Law Enforcement Division, ODCSPER, DA, with a basis of knowledge to develop future programs and policies for Provost Marshal activities.

b. provide the US Army Military Police School with the knowledge to structure courses of instruction for officers assigned duties as Provost Marshals.

c. provide interested persons with a data base to determine what currently serving Military Police officers perceive as their weaknesses and allow for budgetary or administrative action to correct the situation as recommended by the officers surveyed.

The scope of this project is limited only by time and resources. Information on the subject is plentiful; opinions abound. The interpretations of the survey results are products of much thought. This paper presents in detail a synopsis of the data gathered. We hope all readers make a critical analysis of the facts and figures with a view toward making a positive contribution to the enhancement of the Military Police Corps and to the improvement of Law Enforcement operations in the US Army.

We wish to express thanks to Major J.A. Kochenour of the CGSC faculty and to Major S. Chidichimo of Law Enforcement division, ODCSPER, without whose assistance and support this project could not have been completed. We also are indebted to the officers who gave of their valuable time to respond to the survey.

F. Chilton

L. Wisneski

19 May 1977

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface		ii
Chapter 1	The Survey	1
Chapter 2	Personnel Surveyed	13
Chapter 3	Analysis of survey results in Provost Marshal Functional areas	19
Chapter 4	Analysis of survey results in suggested methods of improvement	27
Chapter 5	Recommendations	35
Appendix 1	Sample survey	1-1
Appendix 2	Copy of cover letter used to forward survey	2-1
Appendix 3	Copy of cover letter forwarding results to those who requested project results	3-1
Appendix 4	Summary of responses by total number of responses received by functional area	4-1
Appendix 5	Summary of functional area responses by percent of total responses in each area	5-1
Appendix 6	Chart of responses in functional areas	6-1
Appendix 7	Totals of responses for suggested methods of improvement	7-1
Appendix 8	Completed surveys returned in response to the project	8-1

CHAPTER 1  
THE SURVEY



Are surveys worthwhile? Do they produce beneficial results? Is a survey appropriate to the particular problem being addressed? These are the questions addressed prior to the initiation of the survey. Analysis of functional areas of Provost Marshal activities, although admittedly interesting, is difficult. All Provost Marshals operate independently of each other. The common thread of doctrine and purpose is hard to locate and even harder to interpret in its impact upon daily working operations. The survey structure seeks to find that common thread, sift the wheat from the chaff, and present intelligible, realistic problems faced by Provost Marshals in today's Army.

The type of survey is the second most important function in beginning a study. Should it be long or short, detailed or simple, have enclosures, or be machine scored? The complex nature of Provost Marshal activities makes a long survey easier to compile and is more thorough in its analysis. It is easy to develop a thirty page survey dealing with Provost Marshal activities. Considering the rank of those to be surveyed and the information desired, the short, simple survey is most propitious. The study of Provost Marshal activities is not an effort to analyze an office or operation with a view toward how well a task is accomplished or how effectively time is utilized. Most leaders inspect their own activities as well as receiving inspections from higher headquarters. Hence the survey parallels the purpose of the

study as outlined in the introduction. The purpose is necessarily broad but will produce results to identify general problem areas and trends. Where weaknesses are identified the survey asks for suggested methods of improvement. While brief, the survey is complete and meets the needs of the study of "Functional Training for Provost Marshals." A sample survey questionnaire form is at Appendix 1. The survey consists of two parts: Part I - "Provost Marshal Functional Areas" and Part II - "Suggested Methods of Improvement."

Part I of the survey has thirty-seven defined Provost Marshal functional areas with blank spaces to list areas of import not included. The respondents analyze each functional area to decide if more training emphasis, less training emphasis, or no change in emphasis is needed. The words "training emphasis" mean where does the Army place priorities in how training occurs both Army-wide and locally. Further, the categories seek to identify areas where one-time training is insufficient and periodic updates are needed to keep Provost Marshals current. Concurrent with the philosophy of a brief survey, each of the thirty-seven categories is not delineated or defined. The definition of items generally included in the thirty-seven listed functional areas (1 thru 37) is:

1. Patrol Operations

- foot patrols
- motor patrols
- use of aviation in law enforcement
- patrol supervision
- courtesy patrols
- trouble spots
- radio procedures
- apprehension
- patrol distribution, area, and routes
- shift design

2. Absentee/Deserter Apprehension Program

- report of absentee
- report of deserter
- return to military control
- associated records and forms
- investigation
- apprehension
- disposition

3. Law Enforcement Equipment/Devices

- individual uniform and equipment
- vehicles
- emergency equipment
- radios: vehicle and console
- weapons
- night vision devices
- crowd control devices
- restraining devices
- speed timing devices
- special purpose items (fingerprinting, drug kits, etc.)

4. Vice Control

- alcohol
- gambling
- narcotics
- dangerous drugs
- marijuana
- prostitution

5. Off-Post Law Enforcement Operations

- town patrols
- off limits establishments
- town MP desks
- military apprehension by civil authorities

6. Police Investigations/Investigative Methods

- criminal investigative techniques
- MPI program
- CID program
- evidence
- interviews and interrogations
- records and files
- investigative aids (polygraph, etc.)
- crime lab support
- special funds for investigations

7. Crisis Intervention/Special Threats/Terrorism  
(Child Abuse, Suicide, hostages, etc.)
  - domestic disturbances
  - child abuse
  - suicide
  - rape
  - hostage situations/negotiations
  - terrorist activities
  - raids
8. Civil Disturbances/Disaster Relief
  - training
  - equipment
  - group gatherings
  - aid to communities in emergency
9. Traffic Management (Motor Vehicle Standards, Traffic Control, Accident Investigation, etc.)
  - accident investigation
  - traffic control devices
  - traffic flow patterns
  - point systems and reciprocity
  - TCP utilization
  - VIP, special events: traffic control
  - registration, inspection, etc.
  - speed control
  - dependent school support
  - bicycles, motorcycles, trail bikes, etc.
10. Use of Dogs in Police Operations
  - sentry
  - marijuana
  - cost
  - care
  - personnel to support
  - training: personnel and dogs
  - training areas
  - pursuit of criminals or lost persons
11. Correctional Policy/Procedures
  - Army policy
  - regulatory requirements
  - personnel
  - facility construction and management
  - area concept
  - general overview
  - prisoners from other services



12. Custody/Care of Prisoners

- authorized actions
- custody grades
- reports, records, files
- processing of prisoners
- guards
- work
- daily operations
- Correctional Holding Detachment
- control measures
- funds
- segregation
- weapons
- special situations (disturbances, etc.)
- medical
- dining facility
- rehabilitation

13. Clemency/parole/Restoration to Duty of Prisoners

- clemency
- Retraining Brigade
- release, out processing
- good conduct time
- Disciplinary Barracks
- parolees

14. Personnel Control Facilities

- what are they
- where
- relationship to MPs

15. Temporary Detention

- facilities
- where and when authorized

16. Protection of Persons

- witnesses
- threats to individuals
- MPs and investigators
- VIPs
- funds escorts

17. Security of Property

- all property except arms, ammunition, and special categories

- methods and techniques
- crime prevention
- reports
- aids to security
- equipment and devices
- lock and key control

18. Security of Arms/Ammunition

- arms rooms
- transportation requirements
- central storage locations
- intrusion detection devices
- policies
- lock and key control
- inventories
- requirements
- issue procedures
- crime prevention

19. Security of Special Weapons

- Personnel Reliability Program
- transportation requirements
- access control
- NAICP
- intrusion detection systems
- use of deadly force
- lock and key control
- patrols
- special response forces
- guard force
- special orders
- weapons

20. Physical Security Plans/Inspections

- requirements
- general policy
- methods of inspection
- reports
- personnel

21. Administration, Records, and Reports(MP)

- preparation, use, and disposition of all forms, records, and reports used in general support of MP station activities not including specialized areas(i.e., corrections, investigations, etc.). Examples are Blotter, MP report, etc.
- all other administrative support required to operate a Provost Marshal Office.

22. Force Structure Development(MP)

- TDA
- TOE
- manpower survey
- local
- Army-wide

23. Military Personnel Management(MP)

- promotion
- use of MPs by grade
- rotation of duty assignment
- working hours (shift design)
- company operations
- rating and evaluation of MPs
- skill qualification
- educational development
- MOS reclassification

24. Civilian Personnel Management

- civil service system
- duties
- ratings and evaluation
- authorization for civilians
- hiring and firing
- the CPO

25. Community Awareness of the Military Police

- crime prevention
- community relations
- chain of command
- image
- special programs to promote law enforcement
- police-school liaison programs

26. MIS/ADP in Support of Law Enforcement

- resources available
- requirements
- general knowledge as to what MIS/ADP can do for a given activity, what it is, and how it can help

27. Police Information/FOIA/Privacy Act

- relations with the press
- relations with the Public Affairs Office

- intelligence for law enforcement personnel
  - NCIC
  - release of information
  - requests for information
  - what's authorized and not authorized
28. Military Law
- authority and jurisdiction
  - U. S. Magistrate
  - search and seizure
  - apprehension
  - rights warning
  - rules of evidence
  - SOFA
29. Civilian Law
- Federal, state, and local laws
  - application to military
  - authority off post
30. Budget/Financial Management
- use of funds
  - programming of funds
  - plans
  - authorized/unauthorized expenditures
  - contracts, local purchase, etc.
  - required documentation
31. Joint Service Activities
- Armed Forces Police Detachments
  - Armed Forces Disciplinary Control Board
  - joint/combined staff operations(PM)
  - liaison, technical assistance, etc.
32. Coordination with Other Law Enforcement Agencies
- FBI: relations, jurisdiction, etc.
  - state and local
  - other federal agencies(Treasury, etc.)
33. Management/Construction/Layout of PM Facilities
- physical layout of MP desk
  - MCA and OMA construction
  - R & U
  - duties of various station personnel
  - time/motion studies
  - operating procedures



34. Crime Prevention Programs

- nature
- scope
- applicability
- control
- corrective measures
- surveys
- crime repression
- statistics

35. Juvenile Offenders

- juvenile delinquency
- jurisdiction
- juvenile sections
- apprehension/detention
- offenses
- corrective measures/prevention
- records

36. Army Training and Evaluation Program

- purpose
- types
- use
- applicability
- general description of activities included in MP ARTEPs

37. Utilization of Female MPs

- training
- employment

Part II of the survey lists possible methods which could be used for improvement or change in training in those functional areas checked by the respondent for "more training emphasis-training update needed." Part II is separate from Part I to allow officers to answer the questions at Part I unincumbered by thoughts of corrective action. While the problem and corrective measures are inseparable, the most lucid determination of a problem requires first that the problem be defined. It is then possible to recommend solutions (Part II). Blank spaces are left for officers to add any other methods of accomplishment not listed.

The definition of what is meant by the eight listed suggested methods of improvement (A thru H) is:

- A. Revision of POIs of Present Resident Courses
  - MPOB
  - MPOA
  - NCO advanced courses
- B. Special Short Course (1 or 2 weeks) on the Subject
  - a course at USAMPS specifically designed for personnel being assigned to duties in senior positions in a Provost Marshal office. This course would be attended TDY enroute to such an assignment
- C. Non-Resident Courses, U.S. Army
  - MPOA
  - senior\* enlisted courses
  - a new non-resident course (short) for personnel being assigned duties in senior positions in a Provost Marshal office
- D. Non-Resident Courses, Civilian Educational Institutions, Other Services, and Other Law Enforcement Agencies
  - colleges and universities
  - USAF law enforcement courses
  - federal, state, and local courses where existent
- E. Resident Courses at Civilian Institutions (Educational)
  - colleges and universities
  - junior colleges
  - technical schools
- F. Resident Courses of Other Law Enforcement Agencies
  - FBI
  - other Federal agencies (Treasury, etc.)
  - state police
  - county and local agencies where applicable
- G. Attendance at Seminars, Conferences, or Other Short Duration Work Shops (1 or 2 Weeks) of Civilian Institutions, Government Agencies, or Law Enforcement Groups

- federal
- state
- local
- organizations(IACP, etc.)
- colleges and universities
- junior colleges

#### H. Mobile Training Teams to Field Locations

- established by USAMPS
- one MTT per CONUS at USAMPS or several per CONUS located at major installations by regional areas under USAMPS control

The survey is not all inclusive for reasons stated earlier. Many areas are purposely omitted because they are not of sufficient worth to be included. The blank lines in the survey allow for addition of items considered to be of importance. In later chapters items added in survey responses are discussed. The survey is an attempt to find the most viable means to allow officers to express their views in the most understandable manner with the least inconvenience. Success or failure of the survey is a product of the value or lack of value in the final results of the study "Functional Training for Provost Marshals."

CHAPTER 2  
PERSONNEL SURVEYED



Naturally all senior Military Police Officers cannot participate in the survey. To limit the size of the survey is essential but the survey must still question a meaningfully representative cross-section of the Law Enforcement community. The Department of Army Listing of US Army Installations and Major Activities (DA Pam 210-1) provides the basis from which some sixty-three locations in the Continental United States were selected to be surveyed. These sixty-three are in fact the real heart of the US Army installation system in the Continental United States. While some small activities are on the list there are no inactive or semi-active locations represented. Consideration is not given to locations outside the Continental United States because of the time limitation of the overall study project. Thirty Military Police officers at the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, provide the remainder of the personnel surveyed. The total of ninety-three officers to be surveyed represents a composite group. The group is indicative in experience, knowledge, and feelings of an across the board random selection of persons familiar with Provost Marshal activities and training. A copy of the cover letters used to forward the surveys to the field and the Command and General Staff College officers is at Appendix 2-1 and 2-2 respectively.

Surveys were sent to Provost Marshals of the following installations or activities:

- Aberdeen Proving Ground
- Arlington Hall Station
- Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal
- Fort Belvoir
- Fort Benning
- Fort Bliss
- Fort Bragg
- Cameron Station
- Fort Campbell
- Carlisle Barracks
- Defense Logistics Agency (3)
- Fort Carson
- Fort Detrick
- Fort Devens
- Fort Dix
- Fort Drum
- Fort Eustis
- Fitzsimons Army Medical Center
- Fort Gordon
- Fort Benjamin Harrison
- Fort Hood
- Fort Sam Houston
- Fort Huachuca
- Fort Jackson
- Fort Knox

- Fort Leavenworth
- Fort Lee
- Letterkenny Army Depot
- Fort Lewis
- Fort McClellan
- Fort Lesley J. McNair
- Fort McPherson
- Fort George G. Meade
- Fort Monmouth
- Fort Monroe
- Fort Myer \*
- New Cumberland Army Depot
- Oakland Army Base
- Fort Ord
- Fort Polk
- Pueblo Army Depot
- Red River Army Depot
- Redstone Arsenal
- Fort Riley
- Fort Ritchie
- Fort Rucker
- Sacramento Army Depot
- Presidio of San Francisco
- Seneca Army Depot
- Fort Sheridan
- Sierra Army Depot

- Fort Sill
- Fort Stewart
- Tobyhanna Army Depot
- Tooele Army Depot
- Vint Hill Farms Station
- Walter Reed Army Medical Center
- White Sands Missile Range
- Fort Leonard Wood
- West Point Military Reservation
- Yuma Proving Ground

The response to the survey both from the field and the Command and General Staff College officers was overwhelming. Of the sixty-three officers surveyed in the field, fifty-two responded. Of thirty officers surveyed at the Command and General Staff College, twenty-six responded. This made the field response a percentage of 82.53, the Command and General Staff College response a percentage of 86.66, and a total response percentage of 83.87.

The high response percentage indicates three things:

- a. The keen interest among Military Police officers in functional training for Provost Marshals.
- b. The desire for leaders in the US Army law enforcement community to be as best qualified as they can in the technical skills required to be a good Provost Marshal.
- c. Brief, uncomplicated surveys which are worthwhile will be answered.

In order to provide interested officers a copy of the results of the survey, a special block was placed on the survey form (page 2 of survey). Providing results of the survey acted both as an incentive to participate



in the survey and as an opportunity to receive current information about the feelings of other officers as to the problems addressed. Of the seventy-eight responses received, forty-nine desired a copy of the results. A summary by total (Appendix 4) and percent (Appendix 5) of all responses was provided to all those officers who expressed an interest. A brief cover letter explained the project in summary. A copy of the forwarding cover letter is attached at Appendix 3.

All officers who responded to the survey appeared extremely interested in the project. Surveys were filled out completely with apparent effort. Many additional points were raised and ideas suggested. Some general comments received said "good survey," "long overdue," "very good," and otherwise indicated concern. The small number of officers surveyed for reasons outlined in this chapter in no way demeaned the subject nor did it limit effective response. Effective selection of appropriate personnel to be surveyed played its role and did its job.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESULTS IN PROVOST MARSHAL FUNCTIONAL AREAS

The survey considers thirty-seven functional areas as discussed in detail in Chapter 1. Responses clearly indicate a trend in favor of certain areas and against other areas. In a very general way there is a lack of interest in corrections related categories while there is a high degree of interest in special select areas of military police operations. Certain administrative and management functions also rank in the top categories selected to receive more emphasis.

The survey results give a clear picture of where Provost Marshals place their priorities. These priorities are not necessarily those of previous years and indicate the needs of the future in relation to requirements to best prepare officers to be good Provost Marshals.

The survey ranking of priorities of functional areas present a division of sixteen areas considered to be of highest concern. Six areas are grouped in the bottom or least concerned category with the remaining fifteen areas being in the middle group. The below listings show each group by rank, the assigned survey category number, the functional area title, and the percent of more/no change responses. The percent figure is of those officers responding (78), what percent selected more or what percent selected ~~more~~ <sup>no change</sup> (e.g. for the first ranked item, number 7, crisis intervention, seventy-one of seventy-eight officers responding selected "more" which translates to 91%; while seven of seventy-eight selected "no change" which equates to 9%. This is displayed as 91/9). Some of

the more/no change percentage figures do not add up to 100% which means the remaining percent indicated "less" as a response. In the example above, since  $91\% + 9\% = 100\%$ , that means  $0\%$ , or no one, checked less for functional area number 7, Crisis Intervention.

The top group containing sixteen functional areas is:

<u>RANK</u>	<u>SURVEY NUMBER</u>	<u>FUNCTIONAL AREA</u>	<u>% MORE/NO CHANGE</u>
1	7	Crisis Intervention	91/9
2	35	Juvenile Offenders	74/23
3	26	MIS/ADP	72/28
4	34	Crime Prevention Program	68/29
5	30	Budget/Financial Management	64/35
6	3	Law Enforcement Equipment	63/37
7	27	Police Information/FOIA/ Privacy Act	59/37
8	6	Police Investigations/ Investigative Methods	55/45
9	22	Force Structure Development(MP)	53/42
10	25	Community Awareness of MPs	51/46
11	23	Military Personnel Management(MP)	50/50
12	24	Civilian Personnel Management	50/49
13	18	Security of Arms/Ammunition	45/54
14	19	Security of Special Weapons	42/54
15	20	Physical Security Plans/Inspections	42/58
16	5	Off-Post Law Enforcement	41/53

The middle group containing fifteen functional areas is:

17	28	Military Law	36/64
18	21	Administration, Records, and Reports(MP)	36/63
19	29	Civilian Law	35/60
20	17	Security of Property	33/67
21	16	Protection of Persons	33/66
22	15	Temporary Detention	29/70
23	1	Patrol Operations	29/68
24	10	Use of Dogs	28/64
25	36	ARTEP	27/72
26	9	Traffic Management	27/70
27	37	Utilization of Female MPs	27/59
28	33	Management/Construction/Layout of PM facilities	24/71



<u>RANK</u>	<u>SURVEY NUMBER</u>	<u>FUNCTIONAL AREA</u>	<u>% MORE/NO CHANGE</u>
29	32	Coordination with Other Law Enforcement Agencies	23/73
30	8	Civil Disturbances/Disaster Relief	23/69
31	4	Vice Control	20/72

The bottom group containing six functional areas is:

32	2	Absentee/Deserter Apprehension	13/81
33	31	Joint Service Activities	13/78
34	12	Custody/Care of Prisoners	10/81
35	14	Personnel Control Facilities	10/74
36	11	Correctional Policy	9/86
37	13	Clemency/Parole/Restoration to Duty of Prisoners	6/78

Since the above groups are ranking by priority of the percentage of more emphasis responses, no ranking of the less emphasis response is made. It is appropriate to do so since some areas received numerous checks under less emphasis. The top ten less emphasis responses by percentage of responses are:

<u>RANK</u>	<u>SURVEY NUMBER</u>	<u>FUNCTIONAL AREA</u>	<u>PERCENT LESS</u>
1	13	Clemency/Parole/Restoration to Duty of Prisoners	16
2	14	Personnel Control Facilities	16
3	37	Utilization of Female MPs	14
4	31	Joint Service Activities	9
5	12	Custody/Care of Prisoners	9
6	4	Vice Control	8
7	8	Civil Disturbances/Disaster Relief	8
8	10	Use of Dogs	8
9	2	Absentee/Deserter Apprehension	6
10	5	Off-Post Law Enforcement	6

Note that only one of the top ten less emphasis responses, survey number 5, off-post law enforcement, appears in the top group of more emphasis responses and it is ranked sixteenth or last in the top group. Of the top ten less emphasis responses, five are in the bottom group of six

functional areas where more emphasis is recommended least. There are eight areas of the survey which indicate "zero" less training needed. Of these, six are in the top group of the functional areas considered to be of the highest concern. None of the eight are in the bottom priority group.

The relative harmony among the established priority groupings indicates consistency in the survey document and the trend of the responses. A chart at Appendix 6 graphically portrays the responses in each functional area by percentage of more emphasis responses. Visual comparison indicates the position of importance of each functional area relative to the entire survey and vis a vis other functional areas. For more detailed comparison and analysis of each functional area, complete total response figures are listed at Appendix 4 showing of those responding how many selected more, no change, or less in each area. Appendix 5 converts Appendix <sup>4</sup>~~6~~ totals to percentage in order to indicate in each functional area what percent of those responding selected more, no change, or less. Based on the charts and the consistency of the data, valid trends and images are portrayed of functional areas needing more emphasis, no change, or less emphasis.

The survey participants had the option to add functional areas they considered of import which were not listed. Many respondents listed additional functional areas to be considered. Thirty-four additional areas were recommended in all, some several times. Below is a list of the additional areas recommended. Those preceded by a number in parenthesis were recommended the number of times of the number in parenthesis, (i.e. (7) Combat/Tactical Operations means seven

respondents listed Combat/Tactical Operations as a functional area needing more emphasis). Areas not preceded by a number were recommended by one respondent as needing more emphasis.

Additional functional areas suggested by those responding to the survey were:

- Dog and Pet Catching Operations
- (7) Combat/Tactical Operations
- (2) Transportation Security
- (4) Human Relations Training Program
- Game Warden Operations
- Domestic Disturbances
- (2) Drug Enforcement
- Overseas Operations
- Abandoned Vehicles
- CID Program Operations
- Physical Security of Special Intelligence Facilities
- Access Control/Badge Systems
- Intrusion Detection Devices
- Plans
- Training Management
- Jurisdictional Problems
- (2) US Magistrate Court
- (2) Implied Consent Law/Chemical Analysis/DWI/ASAP
- (2) Organizational Effectiveness
- Intelligence Matters, i.e., Handling and Safeguarding Classified Material, hardware, etc.
- Assimilative Crime Act

- Possee Commitatus
- Security of Evidence
- Use of MPI Funds
- Support to RCMP
- Use of Weapons
- Self Defense
- Operation of Emergency Equipment
- Police Supervision (Desk Sergeant and Patrol Supervisor)
- Internal Affairs Operations
- Management of Law Enforcement Activities
- (2) Press Relations
- (2) PM/CID Coordination/Cooperation
- Ethics

Admittedly many of the above were considered to be part of one of the thirty-seven functional areas on the survey. However, this was an accepted disadvantage of the short, brief survey and not considered a problem. If a person took the time and effort to write down an additional functional area, then that addition is considered to be of some concern. Each added area should thus be considered for integration into one of the thirty-seven listed functional areas or establishment as a functional area of its own. This should be done with those added functional areas of major impact upon Provost Marshal activities and placement of more emphasis or training update.

Survey item number 7, Crisis Intervention, deserves special comment. Of all the more emphasis responses it stands noticeably ahead of all others.



It is seventeen percentage points ahead of the second most important area. Ninety-one percent of all officers responding to the survey said Crisis Intervention requires more emphasis. It is one of the eight areas where no one recommended less emphasis. Crisis Intervention is the functional area most on the minds of Provost Marshals and Military Police officers today. As such it must be in the forefront of any training or update program. The unique harmony of response makes Crisis Intervention and related subjects training the most demanding plea for assistance needed in today's U.S. Army law enforcement community. Neither the problem nor the plea should go unsolved or unheeded. As the most important problem is addressed the other functional areas must also be considered in descending order of priority. The heart of new programs is found in the top priority group of functional areas recommended for more training emphasis and training update.

## CHAPTER 4

Analysis of survey results in  
Suggested Methods of Improvement

The suggested methods of improvement part of the survey has an integral function in the total study of "Functional Training for Provost Marshals." Interpretation of results is more difficult concerning the methods of improvement suggestions and must be tied closely with conclusions reached in Chapter 3 prioritizing functional areas in need of more emphasis. While totals are important in determining which are the most favored methods of improvement, it is also necessary to evaluate each functional area independently to see if a method is uniquely first priority in one functional area while not in another. For the purpose of providing a detailed comparison, a chart at Appendix 7 summarizes the total recommendations from all 78 surveys by each functional area.

The eight suggested methods of improvement listed on the survey can be ranked by total number of times that method was recommended. In the ranking below, each method has a short title denoting what it is. A more detailed description of each method is in Chapter 1. A clear division exists between the top three recommended methods and the rest.

Being so far above the others makes the top three a genuine consensus of what the ideal best methods of improvement are. The other five areas received such negligible interest as not to warrant further investigation.

The following list is the priority of recommended methods of improvement by the total number of times that method was put in the more emphasis column of the survey:

Total times listed	Survey letter designating method	Method short title
395	A	POI revision
355	B	new course
287	G	seminars, etc.
90	E	civilian institutions
84	H	MTT
75	C	non-resident, Army
66	F	other resident courses
25	D	non-resident, other

Sixteen additional suggested methods of improvement were recommended in the blank "other" space provided in the survey. The additional methods were in two categories: those general enough to apply across the board to all functional areas; and, those very specific, applying only to one or two of the functional areas. Methods preceded in the below listings by a number in parentheses indicates that method was recommended that number of times.



The general category additional methods given were:

- encourage Provost Marshals to join local, state, and national police organizations;
- conference/seminar attendance listed in survey method "G" should be for 1 or 2 days instead of 1-2 weeks;
- distribution of new developments (not just Army) through a centralized USAMPS point;
- utilization of technical bulletins;
- (2) develop a 2-4 week course concerning operational problems, techniques, equipment, and new procedures/theories. Require attendance by all officers enroute to assignment as PM, DPM, and PM operations officer;
- constant retraining;
- criteria reference instruction (CRI);
- (2) combat development command-Military Police;
- career development: MPs should spend less time in non-MP related jobs;
- establish academies at large installations to teach subjects needing more emphasis or training update;
- unit training.

The specific category of additional methods given were:

- publications showing tested and approved state of the art equipment (functional area 3, Law enforcement equipment/devices);
- changes in federal law (functional area 35, juvenile offenders);

- just completed MPOA and most emphasis OK, but after four years in a Corps in Europe believe MPs need more tactical operations refresher (added functional area, combat/tactical operations);
- much more education of senior NCOs in MP Corps and senior officers (functional area 37, utilization of Female MPs).

Each of the top three suggested methods of improvement (A,B, and G) has a top grouping of from 10 to 12 functional areas which received the most recommendations. Listings are presented below for each method ranking the functional areas from the highest to the lowest number of times listed as recommending that method for improvement in that functional area. Functional areas marked by an asterisk (\*) indicate that those functional areas were not in the top priority group of functional areas shown needing more emphasis (see Chapter 3). Any programs developed utilizing the top three suggested methods of improvement concentrated on those functional areas in the top priority group.

#### Method A - POI revision

Total times listed	Functional area
20	Force structure development
20	Juvenile offenders
19	*Administration, records and reports (MP)

Method A - POI revision (cont'd)

Total times listed	Functional area
18	Military personnel management (MP)
18	Budget/financial management
15	MIS/ADP
15	Police investigations/investigative methods
15	*ARTEP
14	Crime prevention program
14	*Temporary detention
14	Security of arms/ammunition
14	Community awareness of MPs

Method B - new course

Total times listed	Functional area
24	MIS/ADP
24	Budget/financial management
19	Crisis intervention
18	Juvenile offenders
18	Physical security plans/inspections
16	Crime prevention program
16	Police information/FOIA/privacy act
16	Civilian personnel management
16	Security of special weapons
14	Police investigations/investigative methods

Method B - new course (cont'd)

Total times listed	Functional area
14	*Security of property
14	Security of arms/ammunition

Method G - seminars, etc.

Total times listed	Functional area
38	Crisis intervention
22	Law enforcement equipment
18	Crime prevention program
15	Juvenile offenders
14	Off-post law enforcement
13	Police information/FOIA/privacy act
12	MIS/ADP
11	Community awareness of MPs
11	*Coordination with other law enforcement agencies
9	*Civil disturbances/disaster relief

The suggested method of improvement data provides a good general idea of how more training emphasis or a training update could be accomplished in each functional area. Within the context of the survey the data is not as informative as the totals from the numbers of more emphasis blocks checked; because while all the functional area blocks are filled in



by respondents, not always are suggested methods of improvement recommended. Simply put, part I of the survey takes primacy over part II of the survey in establishing priorities. This is not to say part II of the survey be overlooked because it contains very informative data on what Military Police officers consider to be the most viable options to solve the very real concerns about functional training for Provost Marshals.

**CHAPTER 5**  
**Recommendations**

The data accumulated by the study project "Functional Training for Provost Marshals" provide<sup>s</sup> an abundant source of information for identifying needs of Military Police officers. Many conclusions and recommendations are evident. Clear trends exist as shown by analysis of the survey results in both functional areas and methods of improvement. Everyone must ferret out their own idea of what the data means and what is most needed in the law enforcement community to solve weaknesses in Provost Marshals. The innuendoes and hidden meanings of the results are indeed present. However, the major impact of the study falls into two broad areas:

- the identification of the top priority group of functional areas listed most often as needing more emphasis or training update;
- the identification of the methods of improvement most desired to accomplish such additional emphasis or training update.

It is in the above two areas that the most meaningful general recommendations lie. There are sixteen functional

areas which most concern the officers surveyed. They are:

- Crisis intervention
- Juvenile offenders
- MIS/ADP
- Crime prevention programs
- Budget/financial management
- Law enforcement equipment
- Police information
- Police investigations
- Force structure development (MP)
- Community awareness of MPs
- Military personnel management
- Civilian personnel management
- Security arms/ammunition
- Security of special weapons
- Physical security plans/inspections
- Off-post law enforcement

The first recommendation is: Law Enforcement Division, ODCSPER, provide the above sixteen functional areas to all personnel and activities considered leaders or senior managers in the US Army law enforcement community. These leaders and managers can then use the genuine concerns of Military Police officers in the field to shape plans, programs, and policies which most meet today's needs. Both



regular training emphasis and any training update programs must reflect a priority to the areas in which a demonstrated real need exists. The list of sixteen functional areas most concerned about is the basis from which priorities can be established. The two main reasons an officer feels a need for more emphasis are: observation of existing weaknesses in that functional area; and/or, pressure and emphasis (real or perceived) in that functional area from a variety of internal and external sources. To alleviate either the existing weakness and/or the pressure and emphasis, it is first necessary to identify what areas are key issues. The top priority group of sixteen functional areas is such a list, which, if used, can be the first step in matching training and philosophy with identified requirements and reality.

As a corollary to the above recommendation, the lowest priority group of six functional areas must receive less emphasis. If the highest in interest is important, then the lowest in interest can only be less important. No recommendation is realistic to do away with programs in these functional areas. All functional areas, by virtue of being included in the survey, are major areas requiring a Provost Marshal's skills. Recognizing that some areas are more important, the corollary recommendation is to give less emphasis to those six functional areas that Military Police officers, for whatever reason, are least concerned about.

There are three top suggested methods of improvement:

- Revision of POIs of present resident courses;
- Special short courses (1 or 2 weeks) on the subject;
- Attendance at seminars, or other short duration workshops (1 or 2 weeks) of civilian institutions, government agencies, or law enforcement groups.

The second recommendation is: use the three top suggested methods of improvement in conjunction with identified functional areas to train and prepare officers to be Provost Marshals. No hard and fast rule can or should be used to connect a given functional area with a given method of improvement. All options must always be considered. As a guide the chart below indicates how the survey respondents thought which methods of improvement applicable to each functional area. The percentage shown is the percent of total number of more emphasis responses in a functional area which showed that method of improvement (e.g. in functional <sup>area</sup> 7, crisis intervention, the more emphasis block was checked seventy-one times; of that seventy-one, thirteen selections indicated method A, revision of POI, was the suggested method of accomplishment. This is 18% for method A in functional area 7.) Thus the chart illustrates within within the number of total more emphasis responses, which is the most often recommended

method to provide improvement. The percents do not add up to one hundred because of scattered responses (small percentages) for the least five suggested methods of improvement.

SURVEY #	FUNCTIONAL AREA	PERCENTAGE SELECTING METHOD		
		A	B	G
7	Crisis intervention	18	27	54
35	Juvenile offenders	34	32	26
26	MIS/ADP	27	43	22
34	Crime prevention program	26	30	34
30	Budget/financial management	36	48	16
3	Law enforcement equipment	12	27	45
27	Police information	28	35	28
6	Police investigations	35	33	19
22	Force structure (MP)	49	29	12
25	Community awareness of MPs	35	28	28
23	Military personnel (MP)	46	34	13
24	Civilian personnel	33	42	21
18	Security of arms/ammunition	40	40	17
19	Security of special weapons	35	43	21
20	Physical security plans	35	53	2
5	Off post law enforcement	28	22	44

Using the above figures the top functional areas of most concern for solution under the top three suggested methods of accomplishment are:

Method A - POI Revision

- Juvenile offenders
- Police investigations
- Force structure (MP)
- Community awareness of MPs
- Military personnel (MP)
- Security of arms/ammunition

Method B - short courses

- MIS/ADP
- Budget/financial management
- Police information
- Civilian personnel
- Security of arms/ammunition
- Security special weapons
- Physical security plans

Method C - seminars, etc.

- Crisis intervention
- Crime prevention program
- Law enforcement
- Off-post law enforcement

Hundreds of recommendations lie within the results of the study "Functional Training for Provost Marshals." Only



the two major study project issues are of import here, but that is not to say that the remaining wealth of information is unimportant. The data in the study is relevant to future trends and course of the Army law enforcement effort. All US Army officers must be conscious of the need for good law enforcement. All personnel involved in law enforcement must be conscious of the problems and needs faced by the Army and the Military Police Corps in trying to do the best possible job. The study "Functional Training for Provost Marshals" attempts to shed light on what the real problems are and to suggest a few of the possible means to make improvements.